

Final Amendment  
Serial No. 10/798,165

Docket No. 5000-1-592

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending and stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1 and 4-11 as claim 1 recites elements that allegedly lack antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

For the amendments made to the claims, applicant submits that the reason for the objection has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected. Claims 1 and 4-11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The Examiner asserts that the claim element "so that an event and a service do not influence the backbone network by blocking a predetermined event of the cluster network," is not disclosed in the written description.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for the rejection, as applicant believes that written description teaches the above referred to claim in at least on page 7, lines 1-21 ("... user-selected service devices are connected to the backbone network via the SPs 33 to 37 without influencing the configuration of the network. As a result, events such as on/off or addition/removal of devices have no influence on the network. This will be described in more details with reference to FIG. 4. ... As such, even if one 402 of the devices 401, 402, and 404 connected to the SPs 41, 42 and 43 are removed to position 403, this does not affect the data flow and configuration of the backbone network. .... In the prior art, if the event occurs at each of these events in the backbone network, data may be lost during transmission, thus making it difficult to configure a stable backbone network. To address this problem, the backbone network according to the present invention is kept stable by maintaining SPs in an on state...) and page 10, lines 7-9 ("As illustrated in FIG. 8, fewer SP addition/removal-caused events

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/798,165

Docket 5000-1-592

occur in the inventive backbone network, and the influences of the events in a cluster network under an SP are blocked by the SP."). (emphasis added).

Accordingly, applicant submits that the specification teaches that influences of events in a cluster network are blocked by the SP as the SP remains in the on-state and blocks the event from influencing the network.


For at least this reason, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome.

With regard to the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claim 1 and these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency upon an allowable base claim.

For the arguments presented herein, applicant submits that the objection and rejection of the claims has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues which may be best resolved by telephone, please contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
By Steve S. Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

Date: June 26, 2008

Steve S. Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
Cha & Reiter, LLC  
210 Route 4 East, #103  
Paramus, NJ 07652  
Telephone: (201) 226-9245  
Facsimile: (201) 226-6246